

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 8-36 are pending in this application.

Claims 1, 8-10, 22-24, 30, 33, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Yu et al. (US 6,684,087) in view of Nagata et al. (US 6,701,017), and Sano et al. (US 2002/0196970).

Claims 2-5, 11-13, 15-18, 25-28, 29, 31, 34, and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Yu in view of Nagata, Sano, and Lim (US 7,233,807).

Claims 14, 27, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Yu in view of Nagata.

Claims 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Yu in view of Nagata, and further in view of Minami (US 2003/0117407).

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Yu in view of Nagata, Minami, and Lim.

By this amendment, independent claims 1, 14, 27, and 32 are amended, and as presented below, are believed to be patentable over the applied art for the failure of the applied art to not only disclose, teach or suggest all of Applicants' recited claim features, but in addition for failing to present any apparent reason to combine the references or modify the prior art to create the Applicants' allegedly obvious claim elements.

Claim 1 is Patentable over Yu, Nagata, and Sano

Amended claim 1 recites “a picture data processing unit configured to select, and extract a minimum number of unit blocks using the index information of the picture file formatted data and output a high resolution partial picture of only a portion of the high resolution picture based upon the selected and extracted minimum number of unit blocks,...wherein the size of each unit block of picture data is less than a size of the partial picture” (emphasis added).

Yu, on the other hand, at best discloses displaying the entire picture within the display screen as low resolution data and hyperlinking to a high resolution sub area, wherein a sub area is the size of the display screen.

Amended claim 1 further recites wherein “a scrolling operates to change a position of the partial picture within the high resolution picture by selecting and extracting only those unit blocks which need to be additionally decoded.” The Examiner admits that neither Yu nor Sano discloses a scroll action (see top of page 5 of the Office Action), and relies on Nagata to remedy the deficiencies of Yu and Sano, alleging that it would have been obvious to modify Yu with Nagata because “this would allow for the user to view enlarged portions of the picture.” Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that notwithstanding any disclosure in Nagata regarding a scroll action, Yu discloses predefined display areas based upon a drill down method that is incompatible with a scroll operation. As disclosed in column 9, lines 10-15, a user must enter a request for a sub area to a link server that will provide a detailed version of the selected sub area. In order to view an adjacent sub area, Applicants submit that a user must first zoom out to an enlarged view in order to zoom in to an adjacent sub area.

Applicants submit that applied art fails to not only disclose, teach or suggest at least “wherein the size of each unit block of picture data is less than a size of the partial picture,” but in addition fails to present any apparent reason to combine references or modify prior art to create the Applicants’ allegedly obvious scroll action. Applicants therefore submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over the asserted combination of references.

Claims 14, 27, and 32 are Patentable over Yu and Nagata

Independent claims 14, 27, and 32 are similar to claim 1 in that they recite system and methods of scrolling through portions of a high resolution picture and wherein the size of each unit block of high resolution picture data is less than a size of the high resolution partial picture, and wherein the minimum number of unit blocks associated with each high resolution partial picture is greater than one.

Unlike Yu that discloses a discontinuous viewing of predefined display areas, the recited scrolling feature and method, when combined with unit blocks being less than a size of the high resolution partial picture allows for a fluid transition between viewed screens.

As presented above, because Yu is based upon a completely different system of selecting and displaying predefined sub areas that completely fill the display area, scrolling cannot be incorporated in Yu, and therefore one would not be motivated to combine the individually selectable sub area method of Yu with the scrolling feature of Nagata. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Yu nor Nagata suggest the desirability of combining such teachings. It is improper to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. The Office Action appears to use improper hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination is improper and therefore, amended independent claims 14, 27, and 32 are likewise allowable over the asserted combination of Yu and Nagata.

Claims 2-5, 8-13, 15-26, 28-31 and 33-36 depend from either independent claim 1, 14, 27, or 32, and are likewise patentable over the asserted combination of references for at least their dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

/Yoon S Ham/
Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307

Customer Number: 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: October 4, 2010
YSH/ERM/fyk